

REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action of July 15, 2005. Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In the detailed action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failure to contain all the numerals in the disclosure. Replacement sheets 1, 11, 18 and 19 are enclosed herewith for approval with the numerals added, and the changes made as noted.

It was stated the numeral 148 of FIG. 18 was not in the detailed disclosure, but it is respectfully submitted that it appears on page 18, line 9 of the specification. Thus, no amendments in that regard have been made.

The amendments have been made to the specification as outlined in paragraph 3 of the Official Action, and the paragraph on page 19, which was indicated as being unclear, has been modified for clarification.

It is believed that the arrangement of the locking links has been clarified. The disclosure is believed to provide support for claim 17 and 18, so that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 for those two claims will be removed.

In paragraph 7 of the Official Action, several claims were mentioned as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Each of the claims has been amended herein to overcome these rejections, it is respectfully submitted.

Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims in the prior art is also respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by the Rohrbaugh patent. Claim 1, as amended, is believed to define a structure that is allowable over the FIG. 1 showing of Rohrbaugh. Claim 1 is not shown or suggested by Rohrbaugh. In particular, claim 1 now claims a frame and lift arms that are pivotally mounted to the frame, and having raisable and lowerable outer

ends. The attachment support in turn is mounted onto these loader lift arms to move therewith, and then there is the link that is attached to the attachment support and to other portions of the loader so that when the lift arms are moved relative to the other portions of the loader, this attachment support is tilted about the first pivot.

It is respectfully submitted that is not the case with the Rohrbaugh device which is essentially a dump body, pivoted at the rear of a frame, and then tilted by a hydraulic cylinder. There are no lift arms, it is respectfully submitted that are raisable and lowerable in this reference.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 also defines over the cited British patent 757,638. The claim includes the linkage that is responsive to relative movement between the lift arms and the frame to cause tilting of the attachment about the first pivot. In the British patent, it is necessary to raise the arms and the bucket that is supported on the arms to a position where the bucket is rearwardly extending. There is no link between the frame of that tractor and the bucket that will cause the attachment support to the tilt forwardly.

Thus, favorable action on claim 1 and its dependent calims is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11 and 14 were rejected as being anticipated by the British reference 757,638. Claim 9 has been amended so that the attachment claimed is pivotally mounted on the at least one lift arm adjacent the forward end of the arm, but also pivoted to the rear of the forward end of the at least one lift arm, so that the center of gravity of the attachment is rearwardly of the forward end of the at least one lift arm "with the at least one lift arm in a lowered position." In the British reference, the bucket is pivotally mounted right at the leading end of the lift arms, and it does not meet the feature of claim 9 of having the center of gravity rearwardly of the arm forward end

in lowered position. Note that the bottom of the bucket in the British patents extends completely forwardly of the lift arms in the lowered position. This is contrary to the recitation in claim 9. Thus, it is believed claim 9 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 4 and 5 were rejected as being obvious over the Rohrbaugh patent. It is respectfully submitted that those claims, which depend from claim 1 are allowable with claim 1.

Claim 6 further includes the feature of the mounting of the attachment being rearwardly of the forward ends of the lift arms, and thus it is believed that claim 8 is allowable for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 9. The John patent does show a mixer, but the overall combination claimed is believed allowable.

It is respectfully believed that the rest of the claims, which now have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 are allowable inasmuch they have not been rejected on the prior art. The indication that claims 10 and 19 are allowable is noted, but these claims are not re-written, pending allowance of their parent claims.

Approval of the enclosed replacement drawing sheets, containing the necessary changes is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY P.A.

By: 

Nickolas E. Westman, Reg. No. 20,147
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

NEW:rkp